

# COURTS IN NAVAJO COUNTY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN 2016-2018 SUMMARY



## LOCAL INITIATIVES, DRIVERS, AND PRESSURES

- Continue to develop Web-based information for public about court services, processes, and forms.
- Participate in statewide initiatives for APETS integration, JOLTS integration, e-Court, and LJ CMS data conversion / training / replacement.
- Construct necessary ad hoc statistical and case management reports for Superior Court.
- Expand videoconferencing in Juvenile Detention/Court and more appearance types in justice courts.
- Explore Migration from Polycom system to Lync for video needs.
- Continue participation in county's Leadership Development Program.

## CY 2013/14 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Continued to participate in design of statistical and case management reports in AJACS; restored FARE functionality for superior court.
- Implemented an early resolution court.
- Replaced credit/debit card processing solution with n-Court.
- Replaced all ACAP PCs and laptops with Windows 8.1
- Upgraded Superior Court OnBase system to Version 13 and began daily participation in central document repository; provided historical electronic documents to AOC (from 7/1/2010 forward).
- Enabled courts to participate in Navajo Unified Communication System through AJIN.

## Statewide Projects: Impacts, Concerns, and Participation Plans

<b>LJ CMS</b>	Prefer single system or simultaneous cutover for all courts in county; some functionality concerns exist; will be mid-cycle adopter.
<b>JOLTSaz/SWID</b>	Stakeholder buy-in is critical; desire funding for local implementation efforts; will be a late adopter.
<b>LJ EDMS</b>	Interested in disconnected scanning, but not as a pioneer county; will be mid-cycle adopters.
<b>e-Filing/Std Forms</b>	No input provided; will be mid-cycle adopters.
<b>Bench Automation</b>	Buy-in from the bench is key; will be mid-cycle adopters.
<b>Architecture</b>	Not developing apps locally; previous retirement items almost all addressed; casflow and collections data in MS-Access is <u>not</u> production.
<b>Risk</b>	Still using retirement Kofax Adrenaline hardware solution for scanning but planning to replace when funding sufficient.

<b>TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS</b>					
<b>Project</b>	<b>Year/ Status</b>	<b>Project Detail Provided</b>			<b>Comments</b>
		<b>Full<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Skeletal<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Mention<sup>3</sup></b>	
<b>Improve Telephone Systems</b>	FY17			X	Snowflake & Pinetop-Lakeside JP only
<b>Video for Juvenile Probation</b>	FY17		X		Connect court, JPO, detention
<b>LJ CMS Conversions</b>	FY15		X		All justice and muni courts
<b>Convert Microfilm to Digital</b>	FY16		X		Superior Court, Clerk

Note 1:

An “X” in “Full” indicates that the court has provided full detailed information about the project according to the general parameters outlined in the Commission on Technology’s Project Management Methodology. Also, risk analysis, impact, project costs and funding information has been provided.

Note 2:

An “X” in “Skeletal” indicates that the court provided detail about the local project in the master projects listing spreadsheet. Complete information, usually risks, impact analysis, project costs and funding, was not provided.

Note 3:

An “X” in “Mention” indicates that the court mentioned this project in a summary or listed it in an initiative. It may have been a phrase or a full paragraph of description, but did not contain detailed project-oriented information. If these projects are related to pursuing standards or directions already adopted (e.g., OnBase EDMS implementation, Jury+ upgrade, digital audio in the courtroom), then any mention which includes appropriate funding information is sufficient.